DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 034 822 UD 009 325

TITLE	Annual Evaluation Report on Programs Funded Under Title I ESEA in Maryland, Fiscal Year 1968.
PUB DATE	[68]
NOTE	41p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$2.15
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Achievement, Achievement Tests, Behavior Change, *Disadvantaged Youth, Elementary School Students, *Language Arts, Reading Diagnosis, *Reading Improvement, *Reading Instruction, Secondary School Students, Student Attitudes, Test Results
IDENTIFIERS	*Elementary Secondary Education Title I Program, ESEA Title I Programs, Maryland

ABSTRACT

This report evaluates the 1968 Elementary and Secondary Education Act Title I programs in the State of Maryland. The emphasis of the programs was on language arts and reading skills for educationally disadvantaged students. Evaluation is partially based on local evaluation reports from administrators, parents, pupils, lay citizens, and community leaders. Teacher observations showed marked changes in students' attitudes and behavior due to Title I activities. Test data objectively confirmed the effectiveness of the program in improving reading skills. Four exemplary Title I Projects: (1) Anne Arundel County Preschool Program, (2) Talbot County Preschool Program, (3) Prince George's County Title I Program, and (4) Washington County Language Arts Program are described in detail. An appendix of the test data is included. (KG)

Maryland - General
ED034822

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON PROGRAMS FUNDED UNDER TITLE I ESEA IN MARYLAND

Fiscal Year 1968

PROGRAM REFERENCE SERVICE
CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION

UD 009 325

ED034822

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

PROGRAM REFERENCE SERVICE
CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION

E

09325 E

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON PROGRAMS FUNDED UNDER TITLE I ESEA IN MARYLAND

The major emphasis of Title I programs conducted in Maryland during fiscal year 1968 was on reading and language arts skills. Forty, or 65.6 percent, of the projects designated the improvement of reading and communication skills as their primary objective and the programs sought to implement this objective with specific activities which would enhance these skills for the educationally disadvantaged children.

In the 23 local educational units and Baltimore City, 61 Title I programs served approximately 80,000 children. Although most of these youngsters were public school students, about 6,300 nonpublic school students also participated in the activities of Title I programs.

I. STATE EDUCATIONAL AGENCY SERVICES TO LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY TITLE I PROGRAMS

The ESEA Title I staff has visited all local Title I programs in Maryland. The number visited represented 100 percent of the projects which constitute the Maryland programs.

The State of Maryland is regionalized with an ESEA Title I Supervisor who is directly responsible for a certain area of the State. Each Supervisor made scheduled visits to Title I projects in local school systems. The general purposes of these visits

UD 009 325

were as follows:

A. To discuss the general objectives and administrative requirements of Title I with local school boards, local superintendents, and their staffs.

B. To serve as general consultants to project directors on project objectives, development, implementation, and evaluation, including all phases of assessment of need, establishment of priorities, and coordination with the regular school program.

C. To see the projects in action and to encourage supervisors, principals, teachers, and aides in their attempts to modify traditional programs.

D. To encourage greater participation and involvement of parents and parent groups in educational decisions and activities for their children.

E. To provide leadership and supervision in the administration of project funds to insure that Title I funds are supplementing and not supplanting local and State funds.

F. To monitor the projects and to observe the extent to which the general guidelines and the intent of the laws are being followed.

G. To provide technical advice relating to testing and evaluation of Title I pupils.

H. To set up inter-county visits so that the Title I staff of one county can observe exemplary programs in other counties in the State.

I. To bring about more coordinated working relationships among the various divisions of instruction at the county level.

J. To help develop a climate which makes teaching disadvantaged youth as respectable as teaching other youth.

II. MODIFICATION OF CRITERIA FOR PROGRAM APPROVAL

As a result of what has been learned from Title I evaluations over the past three years, the State has modified its criteria for program approval. ESEA Title I Program Guide No. 44, Revised Criteria for the Approval of Title I, ESEA, Applications from Local Educational Agencies, has replaced Maryland's former criteria.

Program Guide No. 44 was the focus of three regional meetings for representatives from each LEA during the spring of 1968. In addition, the regional supervisors assisted local coordinators with project planning before and during the writing of projects. The points of emphasis were:

A. Concentration of efforts on fewer schools and pupils in the lower grades, K-3.

(Eighty percent of all Title I projects for FY '69 are concentrated in these grades. Very few programs are designed for secondary school pupils.)

B. Early identification of disadvantaged children.

C. Early diagnosis of deficiencies of disadvantaged children and prescription of remedial procedures.

D. Encouragement of more parent involvement in all projects and

insistence that LEA's form a committee of parents of disadvantaged youth.

(This committee is to be involved in decisions on policy and evaluation of projects. The majority of LEA's in Maryland have formed such committees.)

E. Establishment of better evaluation techniques, especially pre- and posttesting for all projects.

F. Recommendation that after schools have been staffed at a State recommended level, and other factors have been taken into consideration, financial priority be given to children's aides for disadvantaged youth since this expenditure seems to yield greater benefits than any other comparable one.

III. EFFECTIVENESS OF TITLE I PROGRAMS FOR MARYLAND

A. Qualitative and Quantitative Evidence of Title I Impact on the Behavior and Educational Achievement of Nonpublic and Public School Children

Although some nonpublic school children participated in Title I programs in FY '68, there is no adequate data on the educational achievement of these students. However, attempts are being made to secure this data for all aspects of the Title I programs for fiscal 1969.

Maryland's judgment is that the programs have had some impact on the educational achievement and orientation toward school of public school Title I children. The best qualitative evidence is the unanimous testimony of the positive effect of Title I as written in the local evaluation reports. The bene-

ficial effects of Title I are reported in the favorable comments of school administrators, parents, pupils, lay citizens, and community leaders. Significance can be attached to these testimonies because they come from individuals not directly responsible for program operation.

The positive effects of Title I were also shown by subjective measures such as anecdotal records, checklists, and teacher observations which were used by all the local units. These measures revealed the following:

1. The majority of the children in the programs experienced marked changes in behavior and attitudes as the result of Title I activities. Specifically, it was recorded that at the end of the various programs pupils were participating more actively in discussions, had a more positive attitude toward school, had a more positive feeling about their own value and worth, were more independent in working on their own, had a longer attention span, and interacted more comfortably with adults.

2. The majority of the children exhibiting various physical symptoms of illness at the start of Title I programs no longer exhibited such symptoms and seemed better adjusted at the end of the projects.

3. At least 50 percent of the children observed in regard to language arts improved one year in reading comprehension and word recognition skills. Marked improvement in commun-

ication skills was noted on the part of at least three-fourths of the children in Title I programs.

4. Approximately 30 percent of the Title I children in both elementary and secondary levels had begun to read library books and magazines.

Information regarding the quantitative evidence of the impact of Title I on the educational achievement of public school children is contained in Section IV of this report.

B. Elements Which Proved Most Effective in Improving the Educational Achievement of Title I Children

The combination of elements most effective in improving the educational achievement and attainment of Title I children seemed to be the clear identification of the need for improvement in language arts skills and the extensive planning for direct and effective implementation of activities to meet this need. This combination resulted in the organization of programs to provide reading instruction on a more individualized basis through the utilization of children's aides and small class groupings.

In accordance with their stated primary program objective, approximately two-thirds of the projects had reading as their primary instructional activity. Methods such as language experience and basal reader supplemented by a variety of new materials and equipment furnished under Title I, were used for the reading instruction. However, in all cases the utilization of children's aides working on an individual or small group

basis with the reading instruction, was designated as the most effective method in improving the educational achievement of the Title I children.

In all cases, the aides had less professional training than the regular classroom teachers, but they worked under the direction of the teachers. While it is well established that the teacher diagnoses, prescribes, and makes decisions, many systems employed helping teachers to facilitate the relationships between the teacher and the aide.

C. Evidence of Program Effectiveness Related to Cost

Although it could not be reliably asserted that cost was related to the effectiveness of the Title I program activities, in most cases where per pupil expenditures exceeded the average expenditure, statistical evaluations of Title I children by pre- and posttesting with standardized measures were made possible. The results of these tests showed substantial gains among Title I children in achievement for language arts and computational skills.

IV. OBJECTIVE STATEWIDE EVIDENCE OF THE IMPACT OF TITLE I ON READING ACHIEVEMENT LEVELS

The objective statewide evidence of Title I pupils' achievement in reading was best reflected by score gains in selected test data. As in the past years, the LEA's utilized varied standardized tests and reported the test scores in various forms (raw and G.E. scores percentiles, etc.). Any attempt to combine these scores to get a SEA statistic would not have been logically valid. However, what

appears to be trend evidence can be stated as follows:

A. Four LEA's reported that statistical tests of significance performed between pre- and posttest results reflected significant gains in reading skills.

B. Three LEA's provided pre- and posttest results which showed extensive positive readiness gains for preschool Title I children.

C. Twelve LEA's presented pre- and posttest results for children in grades 2 through 6 which showed positive growth in raw scores and/or grade equivalent scores for reading skills. A crude statistical examination of the pre- and posttest variances seemed to indicate that these results were statistically significant also.

The lower grades exhibited the largest absolute score gains. For example, in comparing the data of the twelve LEA's for grades 2, 4, and 6 the State found that the gains, noted above, decreased considerably from grade 2 through 6. There were statistically significant gains in two LEA's for preschool projects on reading readiness. These observations seem to be consistent with what has been stated as a national trend that Title I programs are more effective in the early years.

In terms of relating this data to previous years the gain in score trends is consistent for this SEA. There was a significant increase in the number of LEA's which planned the use and reported objective test data.

Data to support the statements made in this section may be found in Appendix A of this report which contains test results from the LEA's on reading comprehension and vocabulary skills.

V. EFFECT OF TITLE I ON THE STATE EDUCATIONAL AGENCY AND ON THE LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES IN MARYLAND

As the result of Title I programs, many changes have taken place in the policy and attitude of both the State educational agency and local educational agencies in Maryland. Some of the effects of Title I on Maryland are summarized in the statements listed below.

A. The attitude of all LEA's and the SEA toward the economically and educationally deprived child has been improved dramatically as a result of the emphasis placed on the education of these children by Title I.

B. Title I regulations have required that LEA's assess the needs of educationally deprived children and design programs to meet these needs. In the process of assessing the needs of educationally deprived children, the LEA's have reassessed the needs of all their children. This reassessment has resulted in program changes throughout the State.

C. The employment of aides in all LEA's to work directly with children under the direction of the teachers has been one of the most successful and accepted changes brought about by Title I. As a result of this success, the majority of LEA's are now employing aides for programs other than Title I.

D. Title I has emphasized the one-to-one relationship of teacher and child. The results of this have been so successful that it has influenced methods of teaching in all LEA's.

E. One of the major effects that Title I has had in Maryland school systems is the change in attitude toward change. With the Title I emphasis on new approaches to the education of deprived children and the successes that these programs have achieved, superintendents and principals have been encouraged to try new approaches in other departments of their schools.

F. The attitude of LEA's toward the involvement of parents has been improved as the result of Title I. However, changes in this area have come about more slowly and will require continued support by the SEA.

G. The success of Title I programs for preschool children was an important factor in the authorization of statewide kindergartens by the Maryland Legislature.

H. Title I has given LEA's the opportunity to try innovative and exemplary programs. In many cases these programs have been adopted by LEA's and paid for with State and local funds.

VI. COMPENSATORY EDUCATION PROGRAMS FOR EDUCATIONALLY DEPRIVED CHILDREN FUNDED BY THE STATE

As yet no Compensatory Education Programs have been funded by the State of Maryland which were initiated specifically to help the educationally deprived.

VII. STATE VITAL STATISTICS

Summarized below are some data concerning the number of districts where Title I programs were in operation, and the number of children and the amount of funds involved in the projects.

A.	Number of Title I districts in which Title I programs operated	24
B.	Total number of school districts in the State	24
C.	Number of Title I projects	61
D.	Total actual amount of Title I funds spent or encumbered in these projects	14,465,816.15
E.	Number of public school children participating in Title I projects	74,368
F.	Number of nonpublic school children participating	6,553
G.	Total number of Title I children participating	80,921

VIII. EXEMPLARY TITLE I PROJECTS

The Local Educational Agencies of Maryland were dedicated in their efforts to plan and implement Title I activities. The many fine Title I programs initiated during 1967-68 in Maryland schools give evidence to these efforts. Although the SEA believes that all the fiscal 1968 programs were in some way exemplary, only four of these programs are described in detail within this report. Two of these were programs for preschool children, one of which was conducted during the summer in Talbot County and the other during the school year in Anne Arundel County. The other two programs which were conducted during the school year in Prince George's and Washington Counties concentrated on improvement in the language

arts areas.

A. The Anne Arundel County Preschool Program

The preschool summer project in Anne Arundel County involved approximately 400 preschoolers, the majority of whom were unable to speak intelligibly or express themselves in sentences, were lacking in learning experiences, were suffering from poor dental conditions, and would not have obtained from their parents the knowledge to help them prepare for the school experience.

Activities were located in nine kindergarten centers in regular classrooms and other facilities where personnel sought to aid the disadvantaged child in his social, emotional, educational, and physical development; to develop for him a new presentation of basic preschool skills in order that he might be motivated to participate more actively; and to improve the health practices of the child and his family. More specifically the program was designed to increase the child's self-confidence, his verbal skills, his physical coordination, and his ability to share and follow directions.

Before the opening of the program a teacher and an aide visited the home of each child to obtain the support of the parents and to meet the child in an environment where he would feel comfortable.

During the 2½ hour session which the children attended every day, instructional activities included vocabulary and

language development, art, and number concepts. The children also engaged in play activities such as block building, housekeeping, painting, and working with puzzles. Every center was stocked with animals such as white mice, goldfish, guinea pigs, or rabbits, as well as the educational games and toys. The active pursuits alternated with quiet activities, rest, and snack periods. Throughout the year field trips were taken to stores, construction sites, zoos, museums, city buildings, and restaurants. Police in squad cars and firemen in fire engines visited the schools.

Extensive attention was given to the health needs of the children. A doctor, aided by a technician from the county health department, gave every child vision, hearing, and dental evaluations, and follow-up treatment. Most of the children were also observed by the psychological consultant, and the staff was given advice and guidance on the results of these services.

Every attempt was made to involve the parents of the children. Back-to-school nights to which parents were invited to visit and receive information on child development and on the aims of the program were scheduled several times during the year.

As a result of the program the LEA believed that the majority of the preschool children were prepared to enter first grade without apprehension. This conclusion is not only substantiated by subjective opinion. The scores obtained by the 318 children who took the Metropolitan Achievement Test in October 1967 and

again in May 1968 indicate that substantial growth occurred. This growth is based upon the fact that there was an average raw score gain of 20.6 points between pre- and posttestings. Furthermore in October only seven children rated above the 50th percentile or the national norm, and only one of these was above the 70th percentile; at the time of the May testing, 118 of these children were above the 50th percentile or national norm, and 59 of them were above the 70th percentile.

Although pupil attitudes were not measured, most teachers believed that the students also became more self-confident and more willing to participate in activities.

B. <u>The Talbot County Preschool Program</u>

The Talbot County program for 80 preschool children extended from June 24, 1968 to August 16, 1968. Having specifically noted that the disadvantaged children who entered the program exhibited limited environmental experiences, poor images of self, and poor concept of school, the Talbot County program personnel planned the activities to enhance the child's self-image and to improve the child's attitude toward school and education. Through kindergarten-type instruction, cultural enrichment activities, use of teacher's aides, and involvement of parents, the project personnel sought to meet the children's needs.

All centers were staffed with trained, experienced teachers selected primarily from the Talbot County School System. Each teacher was assisted by a qualified aide. Teachers and aides were employed

to maintain an average ratio of 15 students for a teacher and aide. Several of the aides came from families of the project participants, and additional assistance was provided by the National Youth Corp workers and volunteers. Regular staff meetings coordinated the instruction and permitted evaluation of progress. Approximately 75 percent of the teachers' and aides' time was spent in kindergarten-type activities such as games, simple reading skills, and field trips, both walking and bused.

Parent involvement was particularly encouraged by the following types of planned and informal activities:

1. Parent meetings were held in each center. (All were well attended.) Many aspects of the program were explained, demonstrated, and discussed, and questions were answered.
2. Communication with the home was initiated and continued through techniques such as teacher/aide home visits, telephone conversations, conferences, interviews, and classroom visitations by the parents. Parents were also allowed to accompany their children on field trips. These techniques, combined with informal opportunities, helped to strengthen a healthy parent-teacher relationship.
3. As a closing activity, a program was presented by the pupils with parents as their guests.

From a subjective viewpoint, the teachers and administrators of Talbot County believed that the children in the Title I program grew socially, culturally, and educationally. This opinion seemed to be substantiated by the results of

standardized tests administered during the program.

In order to evaluate quantitatively the social and academic progress of the project children, Talbot County personnel administered the Pre-school Inventory at the beginning and end of the program. Results of the pre- and posttesting indicated that there were gains on all subtests of the Inventory which included the categories of personal-social responsiveness, associative vocabulary, concept activation-numerical, and concept activation-sensory.

A statistical test of significance was made on the average score gains in these categories, and the gains were found to be statistically significant at the .01 level, a solid indication that the gains were not due to chance fluctuation. Thus Talbot County believes that real progress was made by the group as a whole during the summer, and that these children would be better equipped to succeed in school than they would have been without the program.

C. Prince George's County Title I Program

Prince George's County's program, "Operation: Moving Ahead," was designed to provide the educationally deprived child with a program adjusted to his level of ability to enable him to participate effectively and successfully in learning tasks and to improve his self-image. The program provided for concentrated instruction in language arts - listening, speaking, reading, writing, handwriting, vocabulary, and phonics; utilized children's aides to reinforce instruction work; and provided health education and cultural enrichment activities.

The use of aides to provide reinforcement to the teacher's instruction work was a major element of this Title I program. Nearly 2500 children in grades K-3 in 16 public and 4 nonpublic schools in Prince George's County met with the aides in an area of the classroom or in another part of the building to receive additional instruction in small groups. The aides worked with the children in all areas of the primary school program with emphasis on language arts: assisting the children with specific academic skills such as reading and writing; using vocabulary lists, books, magazines, and educational games to reinforce word recognition skills and phonics; and providing activities which developed skills in motor coordination and correct letter formation.

The aides also used filmstrips, records, and tapes to develop the auditory perception of the students. They told stories and helped the children dramatize plays, poems, nursery rhymes, and personal experiences; and they guided group discussions and worked to improve the children's enunciation, pronunciation, and general speaking ability.

In order to help the children become aware of their environment, teachers and aides took students on trips to local sites, exhibits, museums, and other resources to extend their knowledge of the world around them and to provide meaningful stimuli for language activities. Some activities were planned to afford small groups of children an opportunity to have varied experiences such as cooking breakfast, baking cookies, eating in a restaurant, tasting various foods, and visiting shopping centers.

If a child displayed special learning or behavior problems he was referred to a psychologist for evaluation. Depending upon the results of this evaluation, the psychologist would then meet with the teacher, principal, parents, and program personnel to discuss the case and make suggestions for future work with the child.

Prince George's County also utilized parent helpers who, in cooperation with the social work staff, helped to enlarge the school's role in community involvement by meeting with parents concerning the school's program, home management, and home-based experiments for their children. Parents were given the opportunity to visit their child's classroom and to participate in field trips with the child.

In order to assess the academic progress made by the Title I children, the Metropolitan Readiness Test was administered to grade 1, and the Metropolitan Achievement Tests given to grades 2 and 3. These tests were administered in September 1967 and again in June 1968.

The results of this standardized achievement test data showed that substantial progress was made by the majority of the Title I children over the year. In the low group of first graders which was administered the Metropolitan Readiness Test at the pre- and posttesting there was an average raw score gain of 29 points. Children in grades 2 and 3 grew an average of six months or more in Word Knowledge, Word Discrimination, and Reading as indicated by by the grade equivalent scores on the Metropolitan Achievement Tests. Grade 2 children who averaged four months below grade level at the

beginning of the program were two months above grade level by the end of the Title I program. Grade 3 children who averaged 6.5 months below grade level at the beginning of the Title I program were only one-half month below grade level at the end of the program.

The Bolea Pictorial Self-Concept Test (developed by Dr. Angelo Bolea, Institute for Child Studies, University of Maryland) was also administered in September 1967 and again in June 1968. Analysis of this data showed statistically significant gains (at the .01 level) in self-concept scores over the year, both for total and subtest scores, for the Title I children in all three grade level groups. Thus the results indicated that the "Operation: Moving Ahead" program was achieving a major goal of improving the self-concept of the children who were enrolled in the program.

D. Washington County Language Arts Program

Washington County's program, "A Project in the Language Arts and Related Content Areas - Supplemented by Cultural Enrichment and Health Activities," was comprehensive in scope. The program served a total of 2,543 children for varying periods of weekly participation time. Of the total number of students in the program, 900 of them were involved in Title I programs for at least 1-10 hours a week; 1,200, for 11-20 hours a week; and 443, for 21-30 hours a week.

These children were one or more years below grade level in language arts and arithmetic skills; were deficient in nutritional, physical, and social development; and showed a poor self-image.

To meet these needs of the Title I children, Washington County provided reading instruction, children's aides, art, music, physical education, cultural enrichment experiences, and extensive health services.

In the realm of instructional services, the addition of children's aides constituted one of the main thrusts of the Title I project in Washington County. The aides not only provided remedial aid in small groups, but much individualized attention which enhanced the pupils' academic achievement. Approximately 90 percent of the aide's time was spent in remedial reading and the related language arts areas with vocabulary drill and reading comprehension forming a nucleus of the aide's activities. Supplementary to the instructional activities there were music enrichment programs by professional musicians which proved to be a valuable component of the experiences of the disadvantaged children.

Health education, especially dental, was provided through the program to students in grades 1-6 in cooperation with outside medical and dental associations. Title I nurse-social workers provided additional assistance to pupils and parents in understanding the importance of good health. Direct medical, surgical, and dental services were provided to many of the deprived children.

Home visits by children's aides, nurse-social workers, and teachers seemed to increase understanding between school and family. There was a Parent Involvement Program which the personnel believes has led to improved pupil achievement through the meaningful participation of parents in school related activities and programs.

In attempting to determine the effect of their Title I program activities on the academic achievement and behavior of the participants, Washington County utilized and also developed numerous instruments to measure any change in these areas.

Pre- and posttests were administered in September 1967 and May 1968 to children in grades 1 through 6. The precise tests administered for each grade are listed below with and X beside those where there was an average score gain.

Grade	Test and Subtest	Gain in Average Score
1	METROPOLITAN ACHIEVEMENT TEST	
	Matching	X
2	THE SHELDON	
	Comprehension	X
	Blends	X
	Vowel Sounds	X
	Vocabulary	X
	Total	X
3	IOWA TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS	
	Vocabulary	X
	Punctuation	
	Usage	X
	Spelling	X
	Capitalization	X
	Comprehension	
	Total	X

Grade	Test and Subtest	Gain in Average Score
4,5,6	IOWA TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS	
	Punctuation	X
	Usage	X
	Spelling	X
	Vocabulary	X
	Capitalization	X
	Comprehension	X
	Total	X

Although data for the pre- and posttests were not matched data, (that is, there was not always an equal number of children included in the pre- and posttestings), the results of the standardized testing did indicate concrete growth in the mean scores of the Title I pupils in language arts achievement. The significant growth patterns for average raw score means in the area of language arts is also supported by the substantial numbers of children increasing their percentile ranking according to the national norms between September and May.

A nonstandardized measure, the Dolch Word Test, was also administered to pupils in grades 1-6. Teachers reported that excellent progress was made by all students, especially those in the lower grades.

A "What Do You Think?" checklist was developed and administered to the students in grades 1-6 in September 1967 and again in May 1968, concerning their views on their own ability and interests in reading. Results of this survey indicated that there was substantial improvement in pupil attitude and self-image in relation to the language arts.

APPENDIX A

TABLE I - PRE- AND POSTTEST PERFORMANCE ON STANDARDIZED READINESS TESTS
FOR PRESCHOOL CHILDREN UNDER TITLE I
ESEA IN MARYLAND

Fiscal Year 1968

Local Unit	Project Number		Name of Test and Each Subsection	Month & Year Administered	Form	Number of Students	Score Mean	Standard Deviation	Average Score Change
Anne Arundel	19-68	Pretest	Metropolitan Readiness Test (Total)	October 1967	-	318	26.9	6.6	+ 20.7 Raw Score Units
		Posttest	"	May 1968	-	318	47.6	11.6	
Talbot	49-68	Pretest	Preschool Inventory (Vocabulary)	July 1968	-	69	13.0	5.2	+ 6.0* Raw Score Units
		Posttest	"	August 1968	-	69	19.0	5.0	
Baltimore County	41-68	Pretest	Metropolitan Readiness Test (Word Meaning)	July 1, 1968	A	153	5.8	2.5	+ 1.0 Raw Score Units
		Posttest	"	July 31, 1968	A	219	6.8	2.4	

*Score mean gain is statistically significant at the .01 level.

TABLE II - PRE- AND POSTTEST PERFORMANCE ON THE VOCABULARY SKILLS SECTIONS OF STANDARDIZED ACHIEVEMENT TESTS FOR SECOND GRADE CHILDREN UNDER TITLE I ESEA IN MARYLAND

Fiscal Year 1968

Local Unit	Project Number		Name of Test and Each Subsection	Month & Year Administered	Form	Number of Students	Score Mean	Standard Deviation	Average Score Change
Anne Arundel	20-68	Pretest	Gates MacGinitie (Vocabulary)	October 1967	B	417	14.4	6.1	+ 7.3
		Posttest	"	May 1968	B	417	21.7	8.7	Raw Score Units
Caroline	13-68	Pretest	Stanford Achievement Test (Word Meaning)	September 1967	W	51	12.2	5.0	+ 7.5*
		Posttest	"	May 1968	X	51	19.7	6.6	Raw Score Units
Charles	26-68	Pretest	Stanford Achievement Test (Vocabulary)	November 1967	W	377	19.8	-	+ 3.7
		Posttest	"	May 1968	X	377	23.5	-	Raw Score Units

*Score mean gain is statistically significant at the .01 level.

TABLE II(continued) - PRE- AND POSTTEST PERFORMANCE ON THE VOCABULARY SKILLS SECTIONS OF STANDARDIZED ACHIEVEMENT TESTS FOR SECOND GRADE CHILDREN UNDER TITLE I ESEA IN MARYLAND

Fiscal Year 1968

Local Unit	Project Number		Name of Test and Each Subsection	Month & Year Administered	Form	Number of Students	Score Mean	Standard Deviation	Average Score Change
Dorchester	10-68	Pretest	Gates MacGinitie (Vocabulary)	December 1967	2	177	23.0	-	+ 7.0 Raw Score Units
		Posttest	"	April 1968	3	177	30.0	-	
Harford	1-68	Pretest	Metropolitan Achievement Test (Word Knowledge)	November 1967	A	90	11.8	4.8	+ 7.7 Raw Score Units
		Posttest	"	April 1968	A	90	19.5	6.1	
Howard	5-68	Pretest	Metropolitan Achievement Test (Word Knowledge)	November 1967	A	51	1.7	0.3	+ 0.4 Grade Equivalent Units
		Posttest	"	May 1968	A	51	2.1	0.5	

TABLE II (continued) - PRE- AND POSTTEST PERFORMANCE ON THE VOCABULARY SKILLS SECTIONS OF STANDARDIZED ACHIEVEMENT TESTS FOR SECOND GRADE CHILDREN UNDER TITLE I ESEA IN MARYLAND

Fiscal Year 1968

Local Unit	Project Number		Name of Test and Each Subsection	Month & Year Administered	Form	Number of Students	Score Mean	Standard Deviation	Average Score Change
Prince Georges	39-68	Pretest	Metropolitan Achievement Test (Word Knowledge)	October 1967	B	515	1.6	0.3	+ 0.7 Grade Equivalent Units
		Posttest	"	June 1968	IA	515	2.3	0.6	
Talbot	8-68	Pretest	Metropolitan Achievement Test (Word Knowledge)	October 1967	A	156	12.3	4.4	+ 7.0* Raw Score Units
		Posttest	"	May 1968	A	156	19.3	7.1	
Washington	22-68	Pretest	Sheldon (Vocabulary)	September 1967	1	361	5.7	3.5	+ 4.4 Raw Score Units
		Posttest	"	May 1968	2	369	10.1	4.1	

*Score mean gain is statistically significant at the .01 level.

TABLE III - PRE- AND POSTTEST PERFORMANCE ON THE READING COMPREHENSION SKILLS SECTIONS OF STANDARDIZED ACHIEVEMENT TESTS FOR SECOND GRADE CHILDREN UNDER TITLE I ESEA IN MARYLAND

Fiscal Year 1968

Local Unit	Project Number		Name of Test and Each Subsection	Month & Year Administered	Form	Number of Students	Score Mean	Standard Deviation	Average Score Change
Anne Arundel	20-68	Pretest	Gates MacGinitie (Comprehension)	October 1967	B	417	9.1	4.0	+ 4.0 Raw Score Units
		Posttest	"	May 1968	B	417	13.1	6.1	
Caroline	13-68	Pretest	Stanford Achievement Test (Paragraph Meaning)	September 1967	W	51	9.7	4.8	+10.6* Raw Score Units
		Posttest	"	May 1968	X	51	20.3	8.2	
Charles	26-68	Pretest	Stanford Achievement Test (Paragraph Meaning)	November 1967	W	378	15.7	-	+ 8.1 Raw Score Units
		Posttest	"	May 1968	X	378	23.8	-	

*Score mean gain is statistically significant at the .01 level.

TABLE III (continued) - PRE- AND POSTTEST PERFORMANCE ON THE READING COMPREHENSION SKILLS SECTIONS OF STANDARDIZED ACHIEVEMENT TESTS FOR SECOND GRADE CHILDREN UNDER TITLE I ESEA IN MARYLAND

Fiscal Year 1968

Local Unit	Project Number		Name of Test and Each Subsection	Month & Year Administered	Form	Number of Students	Score Mean	Standard Deviation	Average Score Change
Dorchester	10-68	Pretest	Gates MacGinitie (Comprehension)	December 1967	2	177	14.0	-	+ 5.0 Raw Score Units
		Posttest	"	April 1968	3	177	19.0	-	
Harford	1-68	Pretest	Metropolitan Achievement Test (Reading)	November 1967	A	90	14.9	7.9	+ 9.1 Raw Score Units
		Posttest	"	April 1968	A	90	24.0	11.5	
Howard	5-68	Pretest	Metropolitan Achievement Test (Reading)	November 1967	A	51	1.5	0.3	+ 0.6 Grade Equivalent Units
		Posttest	"	May 1968	A	51	2.1	0.5	

TABLE III (continued) - PRE- AND POSTTEST PERFORMANCE ON THE READING COMPREHENSION SKILLS SECTIONS OF STANDARDIZED ACHIEVEMENT TESTS FOR SECOND GRADE CHILDREN UNDER TITLE I ESEA IN MARYLAND

Fiscal Year 1968

Local Unit	Project Number		Name of Test and Each Subsection	Month & Year Administered	Form	Number of Students	Score Mean	Standard Deviation	Average Score Change
Prince Georges	39-68	Pretest	Metropolitan Achievement Test (Reading)	October 1967	B	515	1.6	0.3	+ 0.6 Grade Equivalent Units
		Posttest	"	May 1968	IB	515	2.2	0.6	
Talbot	8-68	Pretest	Metropolitan Achievement Test (Reading)	October 1967	A	156	15.8	7.1	+10.3* Raw Score Units
		Posttest	"	May 1968	A	156	26.1	11.4	
Washington	22-68	Pretest	Sheldon (Comprehension)	September 1967	1	316	4.4	2.6	+ 3.6 Raw Score Units
		Posttest	"	May 1968	2	369	8.0	3.7	

*Score mean gain is statistically significant at the .01 level.

TABLE IV - PRE- AND POSTTEST PERFORMANCE ON THE VOCABULARY SKILLS SECTIONS OF STANDARDIZED ACHIEVEMENT TESTS FOR FOURTH GRADE CHILDREN UNDER TITLE I ESEA IN MARYLAND

Fiscal Year 1968

Local Unit	Project Number		Name of Test and Each Subsection	Month & Year Administered	Form	Number of Students	Score Mean	Standard Deviation	Average Score Change
Anne Arundel	20-68	Pretest	Gates MacGinitie (Vocabulary)	November 1967	D	215	13.2	4.7	+ 2.0 Raw Score Units
		Posttest	"	May 1968	D	215	15.2	5.4	
Baltimore County	12-68	Pretest	Iowa Test of Basic Skills (Vocabulary)	March 1967	1	200	2.7	0.6	+ 0.7* Grade Equivalent Units
		Posttest	"	May 1968	1	200	3.4	0.8	
Caroline	13-68	Pretest	Stanford Achievement Test (Word Meaning)	September 1967	W	36	12.1	5.0	+ 5.5* Raw Score Units
		Posttest	"	May 1968	X	36	17.6	5.3	

*Score mean gain is statistically significant at the .01 level.

TABLE IV (continued) - PRE- AND POSTTEST PERFORMANCE ON THE VOCABULARY SKILLS SECTIONS OF STANDARDIZED ACHIEVEMENT TESTS FOR FOURTH GRADE CHILDREN UNDER TITLE I ESEA IN MARYLAND

Fiscal Year 1968

Local Unit	Project Number		Name of Test and Each Subsection	Month & Year Administered	Form	Number of Students	Score Mean	Standard Deviation	Average Score Change
Charles	26-68	Pretest	Stanford Achievement Test (Word Meaning)	November 1967	W	327	9.2	-	+ 2.6 Raw Score Units
		Posttest	"	May 1968	X	327	11.8	-	
Dorchester	10-68	Pretest	Gates MacGinitie (Vocabulary)	December 1967	2	5	37.0	-	+ 3.0 Raw Score Units
		Posttest	"	April 1968	3	5	40.0	-	
Harford	1-68	Pretest	Iowa Test of Basic Skills (Vocabulary)	May 1967	1	76	13.8	7.0	+ 4.0 Raw Score Units
		Posttest	"	February 1968	1	76	17.8	6.8	

TABLE IV (continued)- PRE- AND POSTTEST PERFORMANCE ON THE VOCABULARY SKILLS SECTIONS OF STANDARDIZED ACHIEVDMENT TESTS FOR FOURTH GRADE CHILDREN UNDER TITLE I ESEA IN MARYLAND

Fiscal Year 1968

Local Unit	Project Number		Name of Test and Each Subsection	Month & Year Administered	Form	Number of Students	Score Mean	Standard Deviation	Average Score Change
Howard	5-68	Pretest	Iowa Test of Basic Skills (Vocabulary)	November 1967	1	51	3.1	0.9	+ 0.5 Grade Equivalent Units
		Posttest	"	May 1968	2	51	3.6	1.3	
St. Mary's	27-68	Pretest	Iowa Silent Reading Test (Word Meaning)	January 1968	C	167	3.4	1.2	+ 0.2** Grade Equivalent Units
		Posttest	"	May 1968	D	167	3.6	1.2	
Washington	22-68	Pretest	Iowa Test of Basic Skills (Vocabulary)	September 1967	2	339	9.0	4.6	+ 2.6 Raw Score Units
		Posttest	"	May 1968	1	316	11.6	4.9	

**Score mean gain is statistically significant at the .05 level.

TABLE V - PRE- AND POSTTEST PERFORMANCE ON THE READING COMPREHENSION SKILLS SECTIONS OF STANDARDIZED ACHIEVEMENT TESTS FOR FOURTH GRADE CHILDREN UNDER TITLE I ESEA IN MARYLAND

Fiscal Year 1968

Local Unit	Project Number		Name of Test and Each Subsection	Month & Year Administered	Form	Number of Students	Score Mean	Standard Deviation	Average Score Change
Anne Arundel	20-68	Pretest	Gates MacGinitie (Comprehension)	November 1967	D	215	12.6	5.5	+ 2.8 Raw Score Units
		Posttest	"	May 1968	D	215	15.4	6.7	
Baltimore County	12-68	Pretest	Iowa Test of Basic Skills (Reading)	March 1967	1	199	2.7	0.6	+ 0.6* Grade Equivalent Units
		Posttest	"	May 1968	1	199	3.3	0.8	
Caroline	13-68	Pretest	Stanford Achievement Test (Paragraph Meaning)	September 1967	W	36	23.4	10.3	+ 6.0* Raw Score Units
		Posttest	"	May 1968	X	36	29.4	6.8	

*Score mean gain is statistically significant at the .01 level.

TABLE V (continued) - PRE- AND POSTTEST PERFORMANCE ON THE READING COMPREHENSION SKILLS SECTIONS OF STANDARDIZED ACHIEVEMENT TESTS FOR FOURTH GRADE CHILDREN UNDER TITLE I ESEA IN MARYLAND

Fiscal Year 1968

Local Unit	Project Number		Name of Test and Each Subsection	Month & Year Administered	Form	Number of Students	Score Mean	Standard Deviation	Average Score Change
Charles	26-68	Pretest	Stanford Achievement Test (Paragraph Meaning)	November 1967	W	327	17.9	-	+ 2.9 Raw Score Units
		Posttest	"	May 1968	X	327	20.8	-	
Dorchester	10-68	Pretest	Gates MacGinitie (Comprehension)	December 1967	2	5	25.0	-	+ 2.0 Raw Score Units
		Posttest	"	April 1968	3	5	27.0	-	
Frederick	38-68	Pretest	Gates Reading Survey	October 1967	M_2	47	3.9	-	+ 0.9 Grade Equivalent Units
		Posttest	"	May 1968	M_3	47	4.8	-	
Garrett	6-68	Pretest	Iowa Test of Basic Skills	October 1967	3	31	3.8	-	+ 0.6 Grade Equivalent Units
		Posttest	"	May 1968	3	31	4.4	-	

TABLE V (continued) - PRE- AND POSTTEST PERFORMANCE ON THE READING COMPREHENSION SKILLS SECTIONS OF STANDARDIZED ACHIEVEMENT TESTS FOR FOURTH GRADE CHILDREN UNDER TITLE I ESEA IN MARYLAND

Fiscal Year 1968

Local Unit	Project Number		Name of Test and Each Subsection	Month & Year Administered	Form	Number of Students	Score Mean	Standard Deviation	Average Score Change
Harford	1-68	Pretest	Iowa Test of Basic Skills (Reading)	May 1967	1	76	22.0	10.1	+ 5.5 Raw Score Units
		Posttest	"	February 1968	1	76	27.5	10.3	
Howard	5-68	Pretest	Iowa Test of Basic Skills (Reading)	November 1967	1	53	3.3	0.7	+ 0.3 Grade Equivalent Units
		Posttest	"	May 1968	2	53	3.6	0.8	
St. Mary's	27-68	Pretest	Iowa Silent Reading Test (Comprehension)	January 1968	C	167	3.4	1.7	+ 0.3 Grade Equivalent Units
		Posttest	"	May 1968	D	167	3.7	1.8	
Washington	22-68	Pretest	Iowa Test of Basic Skills (Comprehension)	September 1967	2	339	16.2	5.9	+ 5.8 Raw Score Units
		Posttest	""	May 1968	1	312	22.0	4.8	

TABLE VI - PRE- AND POSTTEST PERFORMANCE ON THE VOCABULARY SKILLS SECTIONS OF STANDARDIZED ACHIEVEMENT TESTS FOR SIXTH GRADE CHILDREN UNDER TITLE I ESEA IN MARYLAND

Fiscal Year 1968

Local Unit	Project Number		Name of Test and Each Subsection	Month & Year Administered	Form	Number of Students	Score Mean	Standard Deviation	Average Score Change
Anne Arundel	20-68	Pretest	Gates MacGinitie (Vocabulary)	October 1967	D-2	129	18.4	5.9	+ 3.0 Raw Score Units
		Posttest	"	May 1968	D-2	129	21.4	6.9	
Dorchester	10-68	Pretest	Gates MacGinitie (Vocabulary)	December 1967	2	9	35.0	-	+ 4.0 Raw Score Units
		Posttest	"	April 1968	3	9	39.0	-	
Harford	1-68	Pretest	Iowa Test of Basic Skills (Vocabulary)	May 1967	1	53	21.8	11.8	+ 0.8 Raw Score Units
		Posttest	"	February 1968	1	53	22.6	12.5	

TABLE VI (continued) - PRE- AND POSTTEST PERFORMANCE ON THE VOCABULARY SKILLS SECTIONS OF STANDARDIZED ACHIEVEMENT TESTS FOR SIXTH GRADE CHILDREN UNDER TITLE I ESEA IN MARYLAND

Fiscal Year 1968

Local Unit	Project Number		Name of Test and Each Subsection	Month & Year Administered	Form	Number of Students	Score Mean	Standard Deviation	Average Score Change
Howard	4-68	Pretest	Iowa Test of Basic Skills (Vocabulary)	October 1967	1	105	4.4	1.0	+ 0.9 Grade Equivalent Units
		Posttest	"	May 1968	3	105	5.3	.9	
St. Mary's	27-68	Pretest	Iowa Silent Reading Test (Word Meaning)	January 1968	C	121	5.0	1.4	+ 0.1 Grade Equivalent Units
		Posttest	"	May 1968	D	121	5.1	1.4	
Washington	22-68	Pretest	Iowa Test of Basic Skills (Vocabulary)	September 1967	1	270	12.5	4.2	+ 1.6 Raw Score Units
		Posttest	"	May 1968	2	227	14.1	7.0	

TABLE VII - PRE- AND POSTTEST PERFORMANCE ON THE READING COMPREHENSION SKILLS SECTIONS OF STANDARDIZED ACHIEVEMENT TESTS FOR SIXTH GRADE CHILDREN UNDER TITLE I ESEA IN MARYLAND

Fiscal Year 1968

Local Unit	Project Number		Name of Test and Each Subsection	Month & Year Administered	Form	Number of Students	Score Mean	Standard Deviation	Average Score Change
Anne Arundel	20-68	Pretest	Gates MacGinitie (Comprehension)	October 1967	D-2	129	20.3	8.3	+ 4.2 Raw Score Units
		Posttest	"	May 1968	D-2	129	24.5	9.8	
Dorchester	10-68	Pretest	Gates MacGinitie (Comprehension)	December 1967	2	9	25.0	-	+ 4.0 Raw Score Units
		Posttest	"	April 1968	3	9	29.0	-	
Harford	1-68	Pretest	Iowa Test of Basic Skills (Reading)	May 1967	1	53	37.5	18.1	- 3.2 Raw Score Units
		Posttest	"	February 1968	1	53	34.3	15.7	

TABLE VII (continued) - PRE- AND POSTTEST PERFORMANCE ON THE READING COMPREHENSION SKILLS SECTIONS OF STANDARDIZED ACHIEVEMENT TESTS FOR SIXTH GRADE CHILDREN UNDER TITLE I ESEA IN MARYLAND

Fiscal Year 1968

Local Unit	Project Number		Name of Test and Each Subsection	Month & Year Administered	Form	Number of Students	Score Mean	Standard Deviation	Average Score Change
Howard	4-68	Pretest	Iowa Test of Basic Skills (Reading)	October 1967	1	105	4.5	0.8	+ 0.6 Grade Equivalent Units
		Posttest	"	May 1968	3	105	5.1	1.0	
St. Mary's	27-68	Pretest	Iowa Silent Reading Test (Comprehension)	January 1968	C	121	4.7	2.0	+ 0.4 Grade Equivalent Units
		Posttest	"	May 1968	D	121	5.1	1.9	
Washington	22-68	Pretest	Iowa Test of Basic Skills (Comprehension)	September 1967	1	270	21.0	4.0	+ 1.1 Raw Score Units
		Posttest	"	May 1968	2	225	22.1	7.9	